Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/518,608	PAPPALARDO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
LAGITITICI	Artonic		

		ROBERT E. OFTEREN		2020	
The MAILING DATE of this communi	ication appe	ars on the cover sheet wi	ith the co	orrespondence addı	ess
THE REPLY FILED <u>06 May 2008</u> FAILS TO PLAC	E THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALI	LOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but p application, applicant must timely file one of the application in condition for allowance; (2) a New for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant periods: 	the following r lotice of Appe nce with 37 C	replies: (1) an amendment, eal (with appeal fee) in com FR 1.114. The reply must b	affidavit, pliance w	or other evidence, w vith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from	_				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing no event, however, will the statutory period for Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check eith	r reply expire la her box (a) or (l	ater than SIX MONTHS from th b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WH	ne mailing	date of the final rejectio	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See NExtensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.1366 have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 NOTICE OF APPEAL	S(a). The date on the period of extending the second date of the second date of the second date.	on which the petition under 37 ension and the corresponding hortened statutory period for re	amount o eply origin	f the fee. The appropria ally set in the final Office	ite extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A b	brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 m	nust be fi	led within two months	of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply mu AMENDMENTS	, or any exter	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.3)	7(e)), to a	avoid dismissal of the	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final (a) They raise new issues that would require (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see 	ire further cor	nsideration and/or search (s			cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the appli appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without	lication in bet	ter form for appeal by mate	-		e issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 ar	-	corresponding number of hi	ially rejec	sted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with		21. See attached Notice of I	Non-Com	npliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following					,
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) non-allowable claim(s).	would be all	owable if submitted in a sep		•	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amend how the new or amended claims would be rej. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as foll Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	jected is prov)∐ will	be entered and an ex	planation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a fin because applicant failed to provide a showing was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116 	g of good and				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the entered because the affidavit or other evidence showing a good and sufficient reasons why it 	ice failed to o	vercome <u>all</u> rejections unde	er appeal	and/or appellant fails	to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. A REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	ın explanatior	n of the status of the claims	after en	try is below or attache	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been consideration has been consideration. See Continuation Sheet.	onsidered but	t does NOT place the applic	cation in	condition for allowand	e because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure St</i>13. ☐ Other:	tatement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)			
/Sumati Lefkowitz/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has not amended the claims, and Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the examiner incorrectly characterized the term "power terminal" and submitted the prior art reference Gilbreath et al. (US Patent # 3,959,665) to support applicant's definition of the term. However, Applicant's specification gives no explicit definition of this term, so the examiner is entitled to give the term its broadest reasonable interpetation. The Examiner cites Haydock et al. (PCT publication # WO 01/56133 A1), which is also prior art, and teaches using the term "power output terminal" to describe the output terminal of an inverter (Fig. 1B, Page 17, lines 20-21, 32-36). Therefore the examiner maintains that the characterization of the output terminal of an inverter as a "power terminal" is correct because it is supported in the art, and Applicant has not explicitly defined the term in the specification.